



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fact, and that is, that we are setting up a machinery that is capable of readjusting and correcting possible mistakes—and that is why the League of Nations, instead of wasting time, has saved time. [Hear! Hear!] and we have to shorten our labors, work crowded hours, long and late, because while we were trying to build we saw in many lands the foundations of society crumbling into dust. We had to make haste.

No Men Ever Worked Harder.

I venture to say that no body of men have worked harder and that no body of men ever worked with better heart. I doubt whether any body of men have worked under greater difficulties. Stones were crackling on the roof and crashing through the windows, and sometimes wild men were screaming through the holes. [Laughter and cheers.] I have come back to say a few things [Cheers] and I mean to say them. [Cheers.]

A Member: To save you from your friends!

The Prime Minister: "I quite believe it!" [Laughter.] And when enormous issues are dependent upon it, you require calm deliberation, and I ask for it.

I ask it for it for the rest of the journey, because the journey is not at an end. It is full of perils—perils for this country, perils for all lands, perils for the people throughout the world.

I beg that at any rate men who are doing their best should be left in peace [Hear! Hear!] to do it, or that other men should be sent there. There are difficulties rather more trying to the temper than to the judgment, but there are intrinsic difficulties of an extraordinary character.

Russia.

It is very easy to say about Russia, "Why do not you do something?" To begin with, let me say that there is no question of recognition. It was never proposed, never discussed, for the reasons I have given. I can give two or three more.

There is no Government representing the whole of Russia. The Bolshevik Government has committed crimes against allied subjects and has made it impossible to recognize it even as a civilized Government. And the third reason is that it is at this moment attacking our friends in Russia.

What is the alternative? Does anyone propose military intervention? I want you to examine it carefully and candidly before any individual commits his conscience to such an enterprise. I want you to realize what it means.

No Meddling with Foreign Governments.

First of all, there is the fundamental principle of foreign policy in this country that you never interfere with the internal affairs of other countries. Whether Russia is Czarist, Republican, Menshevist, or Bolshevik, whether it is reactionary or revolutionary, whether it follows one set of people or another, that is a matter for the Russian people themselves.

The people of this Government thoroughly disapproved of the Czarist autocracy, its principles, methods, and corruption. But it was a question for Russia itself. And we certainly disagree fundamentally with all the principles upon which is founded the present Russian experiment, with its horrible consequences—far-reaching bloodshed, confusion, ruin, and horror.

That does not justify us in committing this country to a gigantic military enterprise in order to improve conditions in Russia.

Let me speak in all solemnity and with a great sense of responsibility. Russia is a country that is very easy to invade but very difficult to conquer. It has not been conquered by a foreign foe, though it has been successfully invaded many times. It is a country very easy to get into, but very difficult to get out of.

I share the horror for Bolshevik teaching, but I would rather leave Russia Bolshevik until she sees her way out of it than to see Britain bankrupt. That is the surest road to Bolshevism in Britain.

When Bolshevism, as we know it, and as Russia to her sorrow has known it, disappears, then the time will come for another effort at re-establishing peace in Russia. But the time is not yet. We must have patience and we must have faith.

You are dealing with a nation which, after being misgoverned for centuries, has been defeated and trampled to the ground, largely through the corruption, inefficiency and treachery of its Governments. Its losses have been colossal.

All that largely accounts for the frenzy that has seized upon a great people. That is the reason why the nation is going through the untold horrors of a fanatic and lunatic experiment.

But there are unmistakable signs that Russia is emerging from the fever, and when the time comes, when she is once more sane and calm and normal, we will make peace in Russia.

Praises Wilson's Sympathy.

The idea that America and Europe have been at hopeless variance at the Conference is untrue. No one could have treated with more sympathy the peculiar problems and the special susceptibilities of Europe with its long and bitter memories and national conflicts than President Wilson.

We have never, during the whole of this conference, forgotten the poignant sufferings and sacrifices in this war of the country in whose capital the conditions of peace are being determined. We have not forgotten that France has been rent and torn twice within living memory by the same savage brute. We have not forgotten that she is entitled to feel a sense of security against it [Hear, hear!] and upon all questions that have come before us we came to conclusions which were unanimous.

JOINING THE ISSUE

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

MY DEAR MR. CALL:

I am hardly in sympathy with the peace program of your society, and hence do not feel like becoming a member of it. It seems to me that Roosevelt was in the main right in his size-up of the situation at the present stage of the world's progress—that the world as yet will respect nothing but force. National and international morality is not high enough to prevent war if the self-interest of any powerful nation seems likely to profit by it. In other words, we haven't gone so far but what a real policeman with a real club is needed in this world to maintain order there, and the sole aim of peace societies seems to be to prevent the possession of a club by any nation.

President Wilson's program, if correctly described in the press and magazines, makes me exceedingly weary. A league of nations in the sense that he calls for one, is more than impracticable. Just as in every corporation the control must rest somewhere, so in the League of Nations the control must rest with some nation or nations, and such control be determined not by promises or professions of general altruism, but by actual might. This League of Nations' twaddle, if carried to the last analysis, no matter what its constitutional form, or the professed principles may be, can have no meaning except this, in this clash between different theories of government, the victorious, liberal, representative democracies of the world must take charge of the question of world peace, possess power to enforce peace the world over, and by genuine disinterested zeal in the world's welfare, by honesty and fairness in the use of the whip hand they now possess, by reason of their sweeping victory, justify the faith and pretensions of true democrats the world over. In other words, an offensive and defensive alliance between France,

England, and America, who have in the main the same aims, purposes, and ideals, is all the world needs or can stand at the present time. Such a power may overawe the world, so that its will will be obeyed and respected, and in time, if such is fairly used, a real League of Nations may become feasible. When that time does come it will not be necessary. We and other nations will have moved along from narrow provincial patriotism to a broader, better understanding of what true patriotism is; in fact, the kind of patriotism of your peace writers. So, while your society may be actuated by the highest motives only, its peace plans are 'way ahead of the world of this day.

Hoping you will pardon this rather overlong statement of my reason for not joining you, I am

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. EASTON.

BOOK REVIEWS

War Labor Policies and Reconstruction. (Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science.) Edited by *Samuel McCune Lindsay*. Academy of Political Science, New York. Pp. 224.

Persons wishing to know how some of the leading sociologists, social workers, government officials, and progressive American business men and relatively conservative labor leaders of the country felt about the industrial situation in the country last February and what their prescriptions were for many then admitted ills, will find their thirst for knowledge quenched by reading this symposium of opinion. In the light of the problems of demobilization of the military and naval forces and the civilian helpers who won the war, as those problems have become concrete issues and not abstract schemes solely, much of the talk recorded in this volume already is *passé*. But this fact does not alter the value of the effort which thirty of the best experts made to forecast the future and define the ethics and the technique of the demobilization process, as it would affect labor in general and women in particular and as it would compel adjustment of the soldier and sailor out of a job to a market already well stocked with workers sufficient for the then existing trade demands.

Ten Days that Shook the World. By *John Reed*. Boni & Liveright, New York. Pp. 313, with appendix. \$2.00.

John Reed, a graduate of Harvard and a radical even in his undergraduate days, made his first reputation as a student of revolution and war and a graphic correspondent during the years when President Wilson was slowly but surely maneuvering Huerta out of the presidency of the Mexican Republic. Like Lincoln Steffens, he had a tip as to what was about to happen in Petrograd, and he was one of a small group of American radical journalists who saw the Romanoff dynasty fall and the Kerensky régime come and go. He remained in Russia some time after the power passed to the Bolshevik dictators, Lenin and Trotsky, then returned to the United States where he soon came in collision with the Federal authorities and only recently has he been formally exempted from standing trial for seditious utterances.

This book is valuable not only for the finely written and fully documented history of the rise and fall of Kerensky, and the coming in of the Soviet régime of Communist Socialism, but also because of the clear exposition the author gives of the differences in political theory championed by the many factions and the unprecedented collection of official documents which he accumulated and that are reproduced in the form of appendices. Confessedly a partisan narrative the book nevertheless is and always will be unusually valuable because the author is an A No. 1 reporter and has a vivid, narrative style that is rare.

The Great Peace. By *H. H. Powers*. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 329, with index.

Mr. Powers, in his earlier books, "America Among the Nations" and "Things Men Fight For," had won the respect

of students of national and international problems by his "realism" and rational pessimism. Approaching the subjects with which he dealt, not as a professional jurist or historian or ethnologist, but simply as an intelligent layman who had enjoyed unusual opportunities to move about the world, to study faces at first hand and to appraise relative national and racial achievements with the cool gaze of a level-headed Yankee, he made his first books readable and unescapable by his candor and shrewdness. He has repeated his art in this book, which, of course, finds much of its material and its argument out of date in the light of happenings at home and abroad, which neither Mr. Powers nor any other prophet could have anticipated when he wrote. But even so, it is a stimulating book to read, because of the independence of the author's point of view, and the feeling the reader has that he is not playing the game of critic of "idealism" because of any affiliations he has with a social class or a political party or a leader who may become a President in 1920. So many attacks on the League of Nations' plan and of the procedure of the Peace Conference at Paris have been vitiated by the evident animus of the critic or critics, that it is a relief to come upon a skeptic who at least has the virtue of objectivity and who can approach the discussion of an idealistic solution of the world's need with what is something like calm impartiality and sympathetic understanding of the ethical impulses that generate the idealism.

Evolution of the Dominion of Canada. By *Edward Porritt*. The World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y. Pp. 512, with index.

Mr. Porritt is a journalist and parliamentary historian of English birth, long resident in the United States, whose service as a mediator of information and opinion between the American, Canadian, and British democracies has exceeded that of any man of his calling during the same long period of years. His duties as a journalist and a student of comparative political institutions often have taken him to Ottawa and have led him to write books about Canadian affairs that already are well known to students of history on both sides of the line. In this hand-book he has written in a popular style an excellent story of the Dominion's evolution. If at times it gives interpretations that would not be unchallenged by conservatives it is because the author is a Liberal of the older English school, to whom many of the latter-day chapters in Canadian history seem regrettable. As the neighboring nations, so long at peace and now so closely drawn to each other by common experiences in the war against Germany, pass on into the era of reconstruction of their political and social structures to make them conform to newer social ideals, it behooves Americans especially to know more than they have deigned to know in the past of the democracy on the north, which, in many of its tested methods, is superior to the republic as an effective government carrying out the people's will.

France Facing Germany. Speeches and Articles by *Georges Clemenceau*. Translated by *Ernest Hunter Wright*. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. Pp. 396.

Interest in this book will be deepened and more extensive because of the abortive effort of an anarchist to take the life of "the Tiger," whose virile handling of French affairs of state during the final months of the war and during the sessions of the Peace Conference, now in session in Paris, has made him one of the three outstanding personalities of contemporary history. He is usually associated in the popular mind with unusual physical vitality, and rightly so, especially in view of his swift recuperation from the wound received at the hands of the would-be assassin. Popular appraisal also credits him with wit, ironic powers, extreme independence of thought and will, and a certain mischievousness—to put it mildly—that has made him again and again a bull in the French china shops of journalism, party politics, and legislative action. Moreover, it has been commonly understood that he has stood for the older type of republicanism in an era of increasing socialism, a fact that has not made him liked by partisans of the newer form of democracy. It was left for the war, a terrible national peril, and burdens of responsibility in a fight against foes within